

Interview Summary	Application N . 09/663,889	Applicant(s) NABEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Peter Paras, Jr.	Art Unit 1632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Peter Paras, Jr. (3) _____

(2) John Murray. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 05 September 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: 1 .

Identification of prior art discussed: _____ .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner informed Applicants that upon further review of the restriction requirement of 12/26/01 and election of 3/20/02 it appears that claim 1 was inadvertently omitted from the restriction requirement. Applicants indicated that claim 1 should be examined as part of the instant application. Applicants further indicated that claim 1 could be subsequently restricted from the other pending claims in light of the Examiner's omission of claim 1 from the original restriction requirement. Applicants reaffirmed their election of claims 17-36. A subsequent restriction requirement will be included in the next office action.